

Remarks

Favorable consideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 59, 61-66, 68-72 and 74-86 are now pending in the application, with Claims 59, 66, 72 and 81-86 being independent. Claims 59, 66 and 72 have been amended and Claims 81-86 have been added herein.

Claims 78-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner suggested that the wherein clauses recited in such claims were not adequately described in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. Referring to Fig. 31 and the specification at page 54, line 3 to page 55, line 1, in step S3114, it is determined whether the selection of the setting, i.e., change of the second setting item, should be made by the user. If so, the second setting item is changed in accordance with an instruction by the user in steps S3115 and S3116. If not, the second setting item is changed by a program. Thus, the claimed features are adequately described in the original specification. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection are requested.

Claims 59, 61-66, 68-72 and 74-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,006,895 (Hashimoto et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A feature of independent Claims 59, 66 and 72 is that it can be determined, when the set value of a first setting item displayed in a setting window is changed into a

second value from a first value, whether or not a change instruction by a user is required if desirable to change a third value of a second setting item, displayed in the setting window in association with the change into the second value. Accordingly, the value of the second setting item can be changed in response to an instruction by a user or without such instruction, in accordance with a result of determination.

In the electrophotographic copier of Hashimoto et al., if an automatic magnification selection (AMS) function is being set, the copying magnification is determined based on the input paper size and the thus set size for the scanning system. The copying operation is performed by using the determined copying magnification. On the other hand, if the automatic paper selection (APS) mode is selected, an appropriate paper size is selected in accordance with the selected magnification. If the AMS mode is selected, an appropriate magnification is selected in accordance with a selected paper size. As understood by Applicants, in these copying modes, users of the apparatus can select a value of one parameter (i.e., either a copying magnification or a paper size). As a result of the selection of the one parameter, the other parameter is automatically decided corresponding to the selected value. However, Hashimoto et al. does not disclose or suggest the determination discussed above with respect to independent Claims 59, 66 and 72.

Thus, Hashimoto et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claims 59, 66 and 72.

Newly-presented Claims 81-86 are also believed to be patentable over Hashimoto et al. for the following reasons.

Independent Claims 81, 83 and 85 include, inter alia, the feature of displaying a display window in which a user is allowed to instruct whether or not a third value of a second setting item is to be changed. With such feature, the value of the second setting item can be changed in response to an instruction by a user through the displayed window. Such a feature is not believed to be disclosed or suggested by Hashimoto et al.

Independent Claims 82, 84 and 86 include, inter alia, the feature of when a set value of a first setting item displayed in a setting window is changed into a second value from a first value, not changing a third value of a second setting item, displayed in the setting window for printing, if determined to not be required to change the third value of the second setting item in association with the changed second value of the first setting item. Accordingly, the user is not required to determine whether or not the second setting item is to be changed in association with the change of the first setting item if it is determined that it is not required to change the third value of the second setting item in association with the changed second value of the first setting item. Hashimoto et al. is also not believed to disclose or suggest such features.

Thus, independent Claims 59, 66, 72 and 81-86 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 59, 66, 72 and 81-86. Dependent Claims 61-65, 68-71 and 74-80 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features

of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims.

Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAW\nt

DC_MAIN 216742v1